



<b>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION</b>	Application #	09/913,860
	Confirmation #	5469
	Filing Date	September 27, 2001
	First Inventor	MASUDA
	Art Unit	1764
	Examiner	Nguyen, Tam M.
	Docket #	P07340US00/BAS

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

S I R:

Claims 7-12 stand pending but rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP-06-228570 (hereinafter the "JP patent") in view of Masuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,042,798) (hereinafter "Masuda") and Logsdon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,876,402) (hereinafter "Logsdon"). Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to the claims be reconsidered and the application be found in condition for allowance based on the discussion which follows.

In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that both Masuda and Logsdon disclose a process of making a catalyst, as claimed (Office Action, page 3, last line). The Examiner also alleges that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified a catalyst (desulfurizing agent) making process of the JP patent by making the catalyst as taught by either Masuda or Logsdon because such a method is an effective way to produce the catalyst. Applicants submit that this rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons that follow.

In particular, Applicants contest the Examiner's conclusion that it would have been obvious to modify the catalyst making process of the JP patent by making the catalyst of either Masuda or Logsdon for two main reasons. In the first place, as set forth below, there are factors that **discourage** a person of ordinary skill in the art from